Meeting Notes
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM
NORTH DELTA IMPROVEMENTS GROUP
Thursday, February 13, 2003
9:30-11:30 at Jones & Stokes (2600 V Street)

ATTENDANCE LIST:

Paul Bowers	USACE Sacramento District
Robert Clark	North Delta Water Agency
Gilbert Cosio	MBK Engineers
Craig Crouch	County of Sacramento
Patricia Fernandez	CALFED
Sam Garcia	Jones & Stokes
Dan Gwaltney	County of Sacramento
Walter Hoppe	Point Pleasant
Chris Kimball	DWR
Grant Kreinberg	SAFCA
Gwen Knittweis	DWR North Delta
Topper Van Loben Sels	DPC/NDWA
Roger Lee	DWR/Rec Board
Brad Burkholder	DFG
Steve Sinnoch	KSN
Bill Darsie	RD 2086-Canal Ranch
Don Trieu	MBK Engineers
Chuck Voglesang	CALFED
Keith Whitener	The Nature Conservancy
Collette Zemitis	DWR
April Zohn	Jones & Stokes
Jeff Stuart	NOAA Fisheries
Tom Harvey	USFWS/Stone Lakes NWR
Ron Garfield	Sacramento Corps District
Katrina Chow	Sacramento Corps District

HANDOUTS

- Meeting Agenda
- Public Scoping Information – Dates/Format
- PowerPoint Slides: Hydraulic Analysis of Preliminary Flood Control Alternatives

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME – Gwen Knittweis, DWR

Gwen Knittweis opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and facilitating introductions.

2. PUBLIC SCOPING – Gwen Knittweis, Collette Zemitis, DWR

- **Schedule**: Public scoping meetings will be held February 19th, 6-8 pm, at the Jean Harvey Community Center in Walnut Grove, and February 20th, 1:30-4 pm, at the Bonderson Hearing Room and cafeteria, ground floor.

- **Notice**: DWR filed a joint NOI/NOP in the federal register and with the state clearinghouse, as required under CEQA and NEPA. A notice is being run in the Stockton Record and Sacramento Bee this weekend, and a 328 person mailing was sent out the week of February 3, 2003. Flyers

have also been posted in several public locations in Sacramento and the Delta, and information is available on the NDIP website (http://www.mcwatershed.org/NorthDelta/northdelta.html).

Several suggestions were made to DWR regarding individuals/agencies that should be targeted for notice, but that had not received the mailing. These names were added to the list.

- **Format**: The public scoping meetings will include both a general session and a breakout session. During the general session, DWR will provide an overview of the NDIP project development process and conceptual components/alternatives, and will provide the public with an opportunity to comment for the formal record. After the general session, participants will have a chance to participate in a breakout session by visiting staffed, individual stations dedicated to specific topics, including flood control, hydrology, hydraulic modeling, ecological restoration, recreation/land use, and coordination/integration. Pens and easels will be available at each station to record comments participants may have on a particular topic area.

  NDIG members made several suggestions on the format and content of the public scoping meetings. It was generally thought that providing the opportunity for participants to speak during the general session was beneficial, although it was recommended that a time limit be set for individual comments (i.e., 5 minutes). It was suggested that blank maps of the project area, possibly aerials, be enlarged and provided at the meetings so that interested participants can better illustrate their suggestions for the project team. It was also recommended that a specific person be assigned to deal with comments from the press.

3. SUMMARY OF HYDRAULIC MODELING RESULTS – Don Trieu, MBK

Gwen Knittweis explained that, since the last NDIG meeting, MBK and DWR have used the modeling results from the initial assessment of individual flood control components to develop 7 conceptual flood control alternatives that will be presented at the public scoping meetings. The purpose if this initial modeling was to develop information to formulate conceptual alternatives for public scoping, not to identify the alternatives that will necessarily be carried forward to the EIR/EIS. DWR and USACE will use the scoping meetings to refine the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, methods of assessment, and mitigation measures that will be analyzed in depth in the EIR/EIS; the 7 conceptual alternatives only provide a starting point for such suggestions. Gwen also emphasized that NDIP modeling is an iterative process that will build off future HEC-RAS and Mike 11 runs.

Don Trieu gave a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the hydraulic analysis for the 7 conceptual alternatives. The 7 conceptual alternatives represent variations on the initial 11 flood control components presented at the June 2002 NDIG, and include using Staten Island for flood detention, using McCormack-Williamson and/or Dead Horse Islands for flood bypass/detention, constructing setback levees, and/or dredging. Simulations were based on 1997 hydrology and assumed levee breaks on the upper and lower Cosumnes at the historic January 1997 locations.

Four of the 7 conceptual alternatives use Staten Island as a detention basin. In each case, a new levee would be constructed across the Island, leaving the southern half of the island in agricultural production. The preliminary hydraulic analysis run for the individual flood control components indicated that flooding Staten Island in its entirety would not neccesarily provide the greatest detention benefit for the area because of the extremely low elevations on the southern end. Placing the levee half way down the island would lessen costs associated with dewatering and would allow a

significant portion of the Island to remain in agricultural production.

It was also noted that Staten Island is being modeled as a detention basin, not as a bypass for conveyance. This is based, in part, on the fact that during the 1997 event, flows in the San Joaquin River were so high that back flows on the southern end of Staten Island would have prevented conveyance of water off the Island. Craig Crouch noted that if a flood event resulted in low flows in the San Joaquin River (e.g., similar to the 1986 event), conveyance via State Island could be an option, necessitating that DWR./USACE consider analyzing the effects of flooding Staten Island in its entirety. DWR/USACE will consider this as they continue to refine the hydrology for the model.

Levee breaches on McCormack-Williamson and/or Dead Horse Island were modeled in 6 of the 7 alternatives. Levee breaches were assumed to occur at 1 foot below the top of levee. Bill Darsie stated that the 1 foot level was unrealistic based on his site observations during historic flood events (ie., typically did not breach until top of levee). Assuming that a levee would breach before it actually would could have implications for downstream users (ie., require that they raise levees more/less than what would actually be needed). Craig Crouch and Paul Bowers acknowledged that the 1-foot level was an institutional criteria and that it would have to be balanced against historic observations.

The results of the hydraulic analysis were calculated with a 0.1 foot margin of error, and showed an overall benefit in the upstream portions of the central delta. Downstream adverse impacts to flood stage were more apparent in the alternatives that utilized setback levees and dredging.

The next steps for hydraulic modeling will be driven primarily by the comments received during public scoping. Future results will also further efforts to integrate flood control and ecosystem restoration components.

3. GENERAL COMMENTS

Keith Whitener asked how DWR and USACE will determine which of the alternatives they will carry forward into the EIR/EIS, understanding that there are likely thousands of options for flood control opportunities in the North Delta. DWR is currently working on an optimization study that will help them better define the objectives of the project. Once the specific objectives of the project have been better defined, DWR and USACE will develop screening criteria to determine which project alternatives will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Ron Garfield noted that USACE always requires that alternatives be evaluated for completeness, effectiveness, efficiency, and acceptability. In addition, Chuck Vogelsang noted that the proposed project must tier off CALFED's programmatic EIR/EIS, and, as such, some alternatives will necessarily be eliminated.

Several NDIG members emphasized that the results of the hydraulic analysis were based on the 1997 event and, as such, benefits would only be realized, as portrayed, in 1997-like events. Gwen Knittweis and Paul Bowers noted that modeling will eventually be done for 5, 10, 50, 100, and 200-year events and that they are still working on determining the most appropriate hydrology for the model.

6. NEXT MEETING

The next NDIG meeting is scheduled for 9:30-11:30 a.m. on **Thursday, April 3, 2003,** at Jones & Stokes, 2600 V Street.